

## Planning Committee

A meeting of Planning Committee was held on Wednesday, 6th December, 2006.

**Present:** Meeting: Cllr M Stoker(Chairman), Cllr Mrs J Beaumont, Cllr D T Brown, Cllr D Cains, Cllr M Cherrett, Cllr K Faulks, Cllr K Leonard, Cllr R Patterson, Cllr M Perry, Cllr Mrs M Rigg, Cllr R Rix, Cllr F G Salt, Cllr M Smith, Cllr S F Walmsley, Cllr M E Womphrey

Site Visit: Cllr M Stoker(Chairman), Cllr Mrs J Beaumont, Cllr D T Brown, Cllr D Cains, Cllr M Cherrett, Cllr K Faulks, Cllr K Leonard, Cllr R Patterson, Cllr M Perry, Cllr Mrs M Rigg, Cllr R Rix, Cllr F G Salt, Cllr S F Walmsley, Cllr M E Womphrey

**Officers:** Meeting: F Farooqui, Miss J Hall, B Jackson, Mrs C Llewellyn, R McGuckin, S Milner, S Smith, C Snowdon, Ms C Straughan, P Whaley (DNS); Miss J Butcher, Mrs J Grant and Mrs T Harrision (LD)

Site Visit: Miss J Hall and Miss R Hindmarsh (DNS)

**Also in attendance:** Applicants, Agents and members of the public.

Councillor J Lynch attended the site visit in his capacity as the Ward Councillor.

**Apologies:** Meeting: Cllr C Coombs and Cllr P Kirton

Site Visit: Cllr C Coombs, Cllr P Kirton and Cllr M Smith

### **823 Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Stoker declared a personal/non prejudicial interest in relation to agenda item 13 due to knowing two objectors.

Councillor Cherrett declared a personal/non prejudicial interest in relation to agenda item 14 due to being on the Durham Tees Valley Consultative Committee.

Councillor Walmsley declared a personal/non prejudicial interest in relation to agenda item 14 due to having been involved in a now resolved dispute with the airport.

### **824 06/3081/FUL**

#### **A174 adjacent to Teesside Industrial Estate, Thornaby, Stockton on Tees New roundabout junction and access on the A174**

A site visit took place prior to the meeting.

Planning permission was sought for the construction of a new access onto the A174 from Teesside Industrial Estate. The works included the provision of a new roundabout onto the A174, remedial works to the A174 to make appropriate connections to the roundabout as well as a new roundabout internally within the estate and associated road works.

A total of 10 letters of objection had been received from residents in the nearby housing estate, which backed onto the A174. Two local Councillors had objected to the scheme whilst one had suggested that the existing exit from the trading estate be made a no entry, as it could be positive for residents of Ingleby. Objections to the scheme included the detrimental impact of noise, air and light pollution as a result of the traffic coming closer to properties in

Marykirk Road, at a raised level to the properties and as a result of the traffic slowing, turning, accelerating and queuing at that point. Other objections related to the impact on the existing tree cover, the ancient woodland and wildlife whilst question was raised as to whether it would actually improve the traffic situation or make congestion worse.

The section of the A174 and its immediately surrounding area were designated within the Local Plan under policies relating to the provision of highway improvements, footpaths, cycle routes and open space. The principle of the roundabout was generally considered to be acceptable as a highway improvement; however, issues relating to the precise highway implications of the proposal, the impact on the amenity of surrounding residents and the impact on the surrounding landscape remained to be considered through the submission of additional information and additional consultee's responses.

Members were provided with an update report providing information which had been submitted by the applicant with respect to the Transport Assessment. Whilst it had been indicated that the roundabout could be moved approximately 9 metres to the south of its initially indicated position, additional information remained outstanding with respect to the environmental impacts of the development.

Several additional comments had been received in respect of the application although outstanding comments were particularly awaited from the Councils Landscape Officer with regard to the impact of the scheme on the surrounding environment. It was understood that the Landscape Officer's comments would not be forthcoming until adequate information had been submitted to allow them to fully assess the proposal.

The Highways Agency had no objections but advised that the views of the Local Highways Authority were to be taken into account.

The Head of Integrated Transport and Environmental Policy had considered the proposed scheme. It was advised that there should be an adequate traffic management scheme provided within the industrial estate in order to deter through traffic using it as a short cut. Consideration was also being given to whether the dimensions of the roundabout could be reduced although the information was not available for the meeting.

Environmental Health Team advised that they had no objections, which took into the account the impact of light and noise pollution as well as other matters. It was advised however, that some form of mitigation such as screen fencing would assist in reducing the potential impacts of the development.

In view of the principle of development being acceptable and there being outstanding issues it was recommended that the determination of the application be delegated to the Head of Planning.

Two objectors spoke against the application.

Two Ward Councillors spoke against the application advising that it would have a detrimental impact on the area and local resident's homes and would cause more traffic and congestion.

Members made the following comments:

- Concern at loss of woodland.
- Local residents knew what worked in the area and what did not.
- The roundabout would not help matters; it would add to slowing traffic and add to blockage.
- The application for a warehouse in Thornaby Industrial Estate (06/3080/OUT) was driving this application.
- Standstill traffic with running engines were bad for the health of local residents.
- Contrary to the report, there was wildlife in the woodland.
- There would be significant impact on local residents.
- Requested a full road safety audit.
- During the site visit which took place during a quiet time of the day, a Councillor could not cross the road due to the volume of traffic.
- Stockton Council were supposed to have a green travel plan but there was no provision for pedestrians or cyclists within the application.

RESOLVED that planning application 06/3081/FUL be refused for the following reasons:

1. In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the proposed development would have an unacceptable impact on the privacy and amenity of the occupiers of nearby properties as a result of the increased traffic noise without any clear evidence of mitigation, being contrary to Policy GP1 of the Stockton on Tees Local Plan.

2. In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, it is considered that the supporting information within the planning application has not satisfactorily demonstrated that the roundabout would not impact on the free flow of traffic on the A174 Parkway extension and is therefore considered to be detrimental to traffic movement and highway safety, being contrary to Policy GP1 of the Stockton on Tees Local Plan.

If an appeal is lodged, Members requested a formal hearing take place.

825

**06/3003/REV**

**Former School House and Offices, The Wynd, Wynyard Village  
Revised application for the erection of 5 no. houses and 11. no.  
Apartments with associated car parking, garages and landscaping  
(Demolition of existing building).**

Members were reminded that a previous planning application (03/3034/FUL) for the erection of 4no. three storey houses and 18no. three storey apartments was considered at Committee on the 12th May 2004. The application was amended through its progression to a terrace of 8 houses and 10 apartments but ultimately refused. The proposed development was further dismissed at appeal based on excessive scale and massing and the definition of the land to the rear of the site.

Since then, two further applications had been submitted and withdrawn due to unresolved outstanding matters by the time a decision was to be made, particularly in respect to the nature and definition of the land to the rear of the site and the likely impacts on protected species within the area.

The application considered at the meeting sought permission for a residential development consisting of a three storey 11 unit apartment block, a terrace of four houses and one detached house, associated parking, bin and cycle stores and other ancillary development.

A total of 42 letters of objection had been received in respect to the proposed development. The main areas of objection related to the scale of the development and its impact on the character of the surrounding area, the impact on protected trees both within and adjacent to the site, insufficient levels of parking, detrimental impacts on highway safety, access onto the adjoining highway network and the definition of the land to the rear of the site which was considered to be greenfield and therefore unsuitable for development.

The Head of Integrated Transport and Environmental Policy had raised no objection to the scheme, considering the levels of parking and the highways impacts of the scheme to be acceptable. The Council's Landscape Officer considered additional information was required in respect to the protection of trees on the site although he accepted the principle of development on the site. Natural England had accepted the impacts of the development in respect to protected species.

The current proposals were considered to address the issues raised in the previous Inspector's appeal decision by reducing the height of the apartments, breaking up its roofline and through the re assessment and consideration of the land to the rear of the site. Furthermore, the scheme was considered to be acceptable with regard to its impact on surrounding properties, wildlife and the area in general.

The proposed development accorded with the relevant policies of the Stockton on Tees Local Plan.

An objector spoke against the applications.

The Ward Councillor spoke against the application.

Members made the following comments:

- The design was better but the footprint was the same and the height, including the eaves, had barely changed.
- Lack of sustainability.
- The density was too high without a bus service.
- Requested that density was reduced and that the development was moved away from the trees.

RESOLVED that planning application 06/3003/REV be refused for the following reasons:

1. In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, as a result of the scale and mass of the proposed development, it is considered that the proposed development would result in an incongruous addition to the street scene, being contrary to Policies GP1 and HO11 of the Stockton on Tees Local Plan.

2. In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the proposed development is considered to be contrary to the guidance of Supplementary Planning guidance Note No. 4 of the Stockton on Tees Local Plan relating to high density and flatted development therefore resulting in an inappropriate form of development at this location.

3. In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, as a result of the proximity of the proposed buildings and car park areas to the existing trees within the site, it is considered that the proposed development would result in the potential loss and detrimental impact upon existing trees on the site which are considered to be particularly important features within the street scene. It is considered that the impact on these trees would be contrary to Policies GP1 and HO11 of the Stockton on Tees Local Plan which require developments to have due regard to the contribution of existing trees and landscape features on the site and their sensitivities.

**826**

**06/3080/OUT**

**Teesside Industrial Estate, Thornaby**

**Outline application for the erection of a distribution warehouse**

Planning permission was sought for the erection for a warehouse building and associated parking on land on Teesside Industrial Estate. The building would provide 19,000m<sup>2</sup> of warehouse space with 1,000m<sup>2</sup> of ancillary office space.

The submitted scheme indicated a large rectangular building with car parking to the east and west of the building, with lorry access and manoeuvring to the north and south. Two new vehicular accesses were proposed, one to Fleck Way to the west, and to Earlsway to the east. Tree planting was proposed along the north, east and southern boundaries of the site.

A design and access statement, Flood Risk and Transport Assessment accompanied the application.

In response to publicity, one email had been received from Sarah Green, a beauty (products) distributor on Teesside Industrial Estate, querying what type of products the new warehouse would distribute and whether it would be built near her site at 55A Perry Avenue.

The proposed B8 development (storage and distribution) provided warehousing accommodation on an established industrial site allocated for B1 (business) and B2 (industry). However it was considered that this non-conforming use could be accommodated on the site without prejudicing the Council's implementation of adopted local plan policy. The proposed site layout and envisaged building were considered acceptable and would not have an adverse impact on neighbouring users or visual amenity. It was considered that the proposed development accorded with Adopted Stockton on Tees Local Plan policies GP1 and IN15 in these respects.

Final comments were received from the Highways Agency and the Head of Integrated Transport and Environmental Policy.

The Highways Agency advised that they had no objections on the information presented but requested that the views of the local Highways Authority be taken

into account.

The Head of Integrated Transport and Environmental Policy considered the car parking to be sub standard, that cycle and bin storage be provided, that a green travel plan be submitted with the application that specified junction visibility splays and pedestrian links were required and that the Transport Assessment consider traffic conditions ten years after opening.

The Environmental Agency also submitted further comments, advising that they had no objections but considered it necessary to condition the requirement for a scheme of surface water run off limitation for the site.

Members made the following comments:

- The warehouse would create more jobs in the area.
- Application should be approved but until the applicant sorted out the infrastructure they could not use the warehouse.
- There were plenty of other brownfield sites elsewhere in the borough which would be more suitable.
- Until the access was sorted out, the application could not be approved.
- It would have a detrimental impact on traffic into Thornaby.
- Requested a full road traffic audit be carried out for the whole area of the industrial estate.

RESOLVED that planning application 06/3080/OUT be refused as in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the proposed development is contrary to the guidance of Policy GP1 of the Stockton on Tees Local Plan in that the development would rely upon an unacceptable means of access onto the A174 which in turn would result in an unacceptable impact on the existing highway infrastructure serving the site.

**827**

**06/3180/VARY**

**Parkfield Redevelopment, land at Alliance Street, Hind Street, Spring Street and Templar Street, Stockton-On-Tees**

**Application under section 73 to vary condition no.2 (plans) of planning approval 05/3240/FUL Residential development comprising erection of 114 dwellings and associated car parking means of access and landscaping (demolition of existing dwellings).**

Permission was granted in 2006 for the erection of 114 dwellings with associated car parking, access and landscaping (application 05/3240/REV). The proposal was part of a major regeneration initiative for the Parkfield/Mill Lane area.

Approval was sought for a variation to the approved layout, namely the relocation of plots 59 & 60 to avoid land owned by Rail Track and the substitution of house types on Plots 4, 11, 107 and 111.

The planning application had been publicised by means of site and press notices, as the area was primarily derelict. No representations had arisen from that process or objections from consultees.

The main planning considerations therefore related to visual impact and impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties.

The development of this site and its layout including housing mix was examined in some detail when the previous application was considered. With the new application no significant changes were made and it remained very similar to the scheme approved in January 2006.

It was considered that overall the proposed development was acceptable and was accordingly recommended for approval with conditions.

RESOLVED that planning application 06/3180/VARY be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan(s): unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Drawing Number(s): - 3765 L-01, 3765 SK-001,

2. This approval relates solely to this application to amend the position of plots 59 & 60 and the substitution of house types on plots 4, 11, 107 and 111 and does not in any way discharge the conditions contained in planning approval 05/3240/P, dated 12th January 2005 which conditions apply to this consent.

**828**

**06/3008/FUL**

**ASDA Stores Limited, Portrack Lane, Stockton-on-Tees**

**Erection of new supermarket with car park, service area and associated works (demolition of existing supermarkets)**

Permission was sought to erect a new store of exactly the same floor area (8027 sqm gross and 5110 sqm net) to replace the existing ASDA store on Portrack Lane. It was to be sited on disused scrubland to the south of the existing store facing onto Portrack Lane. It would be of a contemporary functional design with the facing materials being primarily smooth white wall cladding. The car parking areas would be revamped and extended to include part of the land occupied by the current store. Large amounts of new landscaping were proposed around the periphery of the site. Access points would be as existing but the layout included an internal road link between the two. Servicing for the store would be to the rear, off a new access from Marston Road. An existing access would be closed. The application was supported by a Planning and Retail Statement, a design and access statement, a Transport Assessment and a flood risk assessment.

Publicity to the application had resulted in objections from commercial operators on Blue House Point concerned about the inadequacy of the proposed turning facility and the closure of the link through to Marston Road. However, a revised plan recently submitted had addressed the turning head issue and the applicant was discussing other concerns directly with the objector.

Redevelopment of the store on the existing site with same floor space would not conflict with the guidance set out in PPS6 or development plan policy. It presented no significant concerns with regards to traffic generation or highways issues generally. Accordingly there was no objection in principle to the

development.

However, some changes to the submitted scheme were needed to properly realise the future potential of the area. These included not only changes to the siting and layout so as to ensure the development did not turn its back onto Marston Road but also more minor changes such as relocating the recycling area and ensuring proper turning facilities were available on Blue House Point Road aiding the commercial interests of its neighbours. A revised plan on the latter issue has recently been received and is being assessed.

The views of the Head of Integrated Transport and Environmental Policy (HITEP) were received relating to the revised access arrangements including the changes to the turning area at Blue Point Road.

The Head of Integrated Transport and Environmental Policy advised that his comments regarding the cycle storage remained the same.

The proposed turning area was now acceptable and further information would be provided as to whether it would be done under a section 38.

The junction spacing was now acceptable.

The service area was now acceptable as it met the requirements expected of an industrial usage facility in terms of sight lines and radii.

Further information had been provided in relation to deliveries and it was accepted that the service area was acceptable in terms of holding area should be accurate.

The agreement for section 106 contributions was noted and accepted.

Concerns from local businesses relating to land ownership required addressing.

The update report advised Members that the discussions with the applicant's agent had been held on a possible re-siting of the store and other improvements which resulted in a further draft revised plan. The main changes were:

- The service Yard access had been relocated to utilise the existing turning head.
- A landscaped buffer around the whole service yard had been provided but still allowed for 9 x 90 metre visibility splay.
- The updated access could accommodate a 16.5 metre articulated service vehicle, It also allowed for 'queuing' space for service vehicles away from Marston Road, if it was necessary.
- Additional pedestrian links to and through the car park had been added with the route from Portrack Lane being intended as a sheltered/covered route and was not therefore suitable for an additional landscape strip.
- The recycling area had been relocated away from the proposed residential properties which was understood to be necessary to be located on as access.



The agent had also requested that condition 2 d, bullet point 10 as listed in the recommendations in the report, be altered and any subsequent resolution be altered to 'Prior closure of existing store before new store brought into use'. The request was made as it was important to ASDA that they were able to have continuity of trading as part of the proposals and were able to offer a high level of service to their existing customer base. It would not be possible if ASDA were required to demolish their existing store prior to opening the new store for trade.

The comments of HITEP were noted and his concerns appeared to have been largely addressed in the previous revised scheme. However, the further revised plan had only just been received and officers including HITEP required time to consider the implications.

Some changes to the submitted scheme were required to properly realise the future potential of the area.

The requested change to condition 2 d, bullet point 10 was considered by officers to be acceptable.

The issue of land ownership was not a material planning consideration.

It was recommended that approval of the application be delegated to the Head of Planning subject also to the signing of a legal agreement for the financial contribution towards new bus stops and a Puffin crossing on Portrack Lane. If agreement was not reached by the target date of 27th December the applicants would be asked to withdraw the application until agreement was reached or if reluctant to do so, then the application would be refused.

An objector spoke against the application.

A Member requested that a pedestrian crossing be placed on Marston Road.

RESOLVED that:

1. The decision in respect of planning application 06/3008/FUL be delegated to the Head of Planning
2. That approval is subject to:
  - a. The application being referred to the Secretary of State in accordance with the Town & Country Planning (Shopping Development) (England and Wales (No 2) Direction 1993.
  - b. Resolution of the outstanding siting and access issues,
  - c. The completion of a 106 agreement in accordance with the Heads of Terms and
  - d. Subject to planning conditions covering the following matters:
    - Approved plans

- Site remediation and Landfill gas
- Drainage
- Floor levels
- Oil storage
- Oil interceptor
- Relocation of recycling facilities
- Materials
- Limit on retail floor space to that specified in the application
- Prior closure of existing store before new store brought into use.
- Means of enclosure
- Cycle parking
- Travel plan
- Outstanding highway concerns
- Landscaping, planting and maintenance details
- Any other relevant matters
- Provision of pedestrian crossing from ASDA site to other side of Road

3. In the event of there still being outstanding matters on 22nd December 2006 that the application is refused.

Heads of terms

- Financial contribution for the provision of two low level bus stops (£12,000)
- Financial contribution for the provision of a Puffin Crossing (£55,000)

**829**

**06/2593/OUT**

**Land at Low Lane, Ingleby Barwick, Stockton on Tees**

**Outline application for mixed use including family pub, playbarn, lodge and children's nursery**

The item was withdrawn prior to the meeting.

**830**

**06/3027/OUT**

**Former Wimpey headquarters site, Bowesfield lane, Stockton.**

**Outline application for new office/industrial business campus.**

The application was one of three applications proposed for the site. All applications related to the land which formed the former Wimpey Offices and depot/storage yard (06/3027/OUT, 06/3028/FUL and 06/3043/FUL).

The application site measured approximately 1.8 hectares and lay approximately 2 metres to the south of Stockton Town Centre and was prominently situated adjacent to the newly constructed South Stockton Link Road and the A66. An existing office block lay in the western edge of the site with the former storage and distribution yard/depot that occupied the majority of the eastern area of the site; existing landscaping surrounded the site in the form of a tree belt and landscaping mound.

Outline planning permission was sought to establish the principle of development for a business/industrial campus. The proposal outlined five phases of development for various sized industrial units.

RESOLVED that planning application 06/3027/OUT be delegated to the Head of Planning and Environment for approval subject to no adverse comments from statutory consultees and the following conditions.  
In the event there are still outstanding matters on 22nd December 2006 the application be refused.

Approved Plans  
Time limits  
Reserved matters  
Design Guide/specification  
Materials  
Drainage (foul and surface)  
Landscaping Plan (hard construction)  
Landscaping – Planting plan  
Planting and Maintenance specification  
Means of enclosure  
Tree protection measures  
Land Contamination  
Construction Noise (8am-6pm Monday-Friday, 8am-1pm Saturday)  
Proposed Levels  
Lighting details  
Covered cycle parking  
Bin Storage

Policy GP1, EN30 and EN32a of the adopted Stockton-on-Tees Local Plan, Planning Policy Guidance 4: Industrial, commercial development and small firms, Planning Policy Guidance No. 25: Development and Flood Risk, Planning policy Statement 1: Creating Sustainable Communities and Planning Policy Statement No.6: Planning For Town Centres are considered to be relevant to this decision.

831

**06/3043/FUL**

**Former Wimpey Headquarters Site, Bowesfield Lane, Stockton-on-Tees  
Erection of 3 storey headquarter office building with associated service access, car parking and landscaping.**

The application was one of three applications proposed for the site. All applications related to the land which formed the former Wimpey Offices and depot/storage yard (06/3027/OUT, 06/3028/FUL and 06/3043/FUL).

The application site measured approximately 1.8 hectares and lay approximately 2 metres to the south of Stockton Town Centre and was prominently situated adjacent to the newly constructed South Stockton Link Road and the A66. An existing office block lay in the western edge of the site with the former storage and distribution yard/depot that occupied the majority of the eastern area of the site; existing landscaping surrounded the site in the form of a tree belt and landscaping mound.

Planning permission was sought for the erection of a contemporary three-storey headquarters office building. The building would provide approximately 6,500 sq.m of floorspace and was intended to serve around 600 employees. A total of

284 parking spaces were provided.

RESOLVED that planning application 06/3043/FUL to be delegated to the Head of Planning and Environment for approval subject to no adverse comments from statutory consultees and the following conditions below.

In the event there are still outstanding matters on 21st December 2006 the application be refused.

Approved Plans

Time limits

Materials

Drainage (foul and surface)

Landscaping Plan (hard construction)

Landscaping – Planting plan

Planting and Maintenance specification

Means of enclosure

Tree protection measures

Surface water run-off

Land Contamination

Construction Noise (8am-6pm Monday-Friday, 8am-1pm Saturday)

Proposed Levels

Lighting details

Covered cycle parking

Bin Storage

And any additional conditions is as seen to be necessary

Policy GP1, EN30 and EN32a of the adopted Stockton-on-Tees Local Plan, Planning Policy Guidance 4: Industrial, commercial development and small firms, Planning Policy Guidance No. 25: Development and Flood Risk, Planning policy Statement 1: Creating Sustainable Communities and Planning Policy Statement No.6: Planning For Town Centres are considered to be relevant to this decision.

832

**06/3028/FUL**

**Former Wimpey Headquarters site, Bowesfield lane, Stockton.**

**Erection of 2 no. Three storey office blocks plus associated service access, car parking and landscaping, re-organisation of existing car parking and landscaping to existing office building**

The application was one of three applications proposed for the site. All applications related to the land which formed the former Wimpey Offices and depot/storage yard (06/3027/OUT, 06/3028/FUL and 06/3043/FUL).

The application site measured approximately 1.8 hectares and lay approximately 2 metres to the south of Stockton Town Centre and was prominently situated adjacent to the newly constructed South Stockton Link Road and the A66. An existing office block lay in the western edge of the site with the former storage and distribution yard/depot that occupied the majority of the eastern area of the site; existing landscaping surrounded the site in the form of a tree belt and landscaping mound.

Planning permission was sought for the erection for 2no. contemporary three-storey office buildings. Unit 1A 1,700 sq metres of floor space and Unit 2 would provide 2,100 sq metres.

RESOLVED that planning application 06/3028/FUL to be delegated to the Head of Planning and Environment for approval subject to no adverse comments from statutory consultees, the following conditions and a commuted lump sum towards increased landscaping provision.

In the event there are still outstanding matters on 21st December 2006 the application be refused.

Approved Plans

Time limits

Materials

Drainage (foul and surface)

Landscaping Plan (hard construction)

Landscaping – Planting plan

Planting and Maintenance specification

Means of enclosure

Tree protection measures

Land Contamination

Construction Noise (8am-6pm Monday-Friday, 8am-1pm Saturday)

Proposed Levels

Lighting details

Covered cycle parking

Bin Storage

Heads of Terms

Committed lump sum of £63,000 towards a strategic landscaping area outside the boundaries of the site.

833

**06/2927/VARY**

**Bowesfield farm, Bowesfield Lane, Preston Farm Industrial Estate, Stockton-on-Tees**

**Application under Section 73 to vary condition no. 2 (approved plan) of planning approval 04/3904/REM reserved matters application for 2223 sq metres of offices (including option for restaurant) 20 houses and 56 apartments, associated landscaping and car parking**

Planning permission was sought for the variation of the approved plans under a Section 73 application, for a mixed-use development off Bowesfield Lane, known as Bowesfield Park (04/3904/REM). In 2004, an application for the approval of reserved matters granted for the erection of two offices buildings, 20 town houses and three buildings containing 56 apartments, associated car parking and landscaping.

The application presented to Members related solely to two office units, and comprised small changes to the external appearance of the building, including alterations to the roof, a reworked parking layout and removal of an A3 (Restaurant/Café) use from Unit 1 office.

The application sought a 'variation' of the permission to amend condition 1 to allow variations to the approved scheme, set out below:

An application for a planning permission under Section 73, allowed the Local Planning Authority the opportunity, should it wish, to revisit any or all of the conditions attached to the previous permission; it did not however, allow the Authority to revisit of the principle of development.

The main planning considerations were therefore the implication of the proposal on visual amenity, the amenity of the users of adjacent properties and access and highway safety considerations.

It was considered that the proposed changes as set out in the amended plans would not have an adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring land users, nor access and highway safety considerations, and in these respects it could be concluded that the proposal accorded with GP1 and TR15 of the Adopted Stockton on Tees Local Plan. However, the final assessment of the Landscape Officer was awaited and the impact of the proposal in terms of design and visual impact could only be made once those comments were received. If there were matters outstanding on the 23rd December 2006 that planning permission should be refused.

RESOLVED that the decision in respect of planning application 06/2927/VARY be delegated to the Head of Planning and subject to a favourable response from the Council's Landscape Officer that planning permission be granted. Otherwise, if there are matters outstanding on the 23rd December 2006 that planning permission is refused.

1. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan(s); unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Drawing Numbers: -

B547-108 Site location Plan

HJB/457/PA87 Landscape Setting & Cross Section

B547-101REV B - Commercial Unit 1 - Proposed Floor Plans

B457-102 REV D- Commercial Unit 1 - Proposed Elevations

B457-103 REV B - Commercial Unit 2 - Proposed Floor Plans

B457-104 REV D- Commercial Unit 2 - Proposed Elevations

B457-106 REV C - Proposed Residential/Commercial Site Plan

2. A minimum of two weeks notice will be given in writing by the developer of the permission hereby approved to both the Local Planning Authority and the occupants of Unit 7 Riverside View, Bowesfield Crescent, Bowesfield Lane Industrial Estate, Stockton on Tees, TS18 3BL prior to the commencement of any ground works at the site and any other works involving the compaction of the ground being carried out in conjunction with the development hereby approved.

3. Nothing in this permission other than the variation of condition no. 2 of application 04/3904/REM shall be construed as discharging the conditions attached to permissions 04/3904/REM and 01/0600/P.

4. Notwithstanding the submitted landscape plan, within three months from the date of this approval a revised landscaping plan for the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Details of which should provide for the treatment of the revised layout and shall be implemented in accordance with the approved plan within the first planting season following the occupation of the office buildings.

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposed variations to the approved development are particularly minor and as such would have limited impact on the appearance of the development as well as limited impact on surrounding uses. As such, it is considered that the development would remain to be acceptable under policies GP1 and TR15 of the Stockton on Tees Local Plan.

834

**06/3288/LA**

**Parkside Centre, 9 Melrose Avenue, Billingham**

**Revised application for the extension to existing car park to create 41 no. parking spaces (including disabled) and installation of 4no. 4m high lighting columns.**

The application site was a Mental Health Day unit situated on Melrose Avenue, Billingham.

Planning permission was sought for the extension to the existing car park to create an extra 6 spaces for the centre, and the installation of four 4m high lighting columns. The creation of the car park would involve the removal of approximately 3 trees on the site.

The proposal had been publicised by means of individual letters of notification to neighbours. One letter of representation and three consultation responses had been received since the completion of the original report. The letter of representation raised objection over the trees and the need for lighting.

It was considered that subject to the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on the visual amenity and the street scene, the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties nor highway safety and therefore the proposal accorded with Policy GP1 of the Stockton on Tees Local Plan. There were no other material considerations which indicated otherwise therefore it was recommended that planning permission be granted.

RESOLVED that planning application 06/3288/LA be approved subject to the following conditions, and any other considered relevant and necessary:

1. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Drawing numbers(s) 0255-0883-8592-W3 Rev D, 0255-0883-8592-E3 Rev A, 0255-0883-8592-E5.

2. The sizes of the replacement trees as identified on plan no. 0255-0883-8592-W3 Rev D shall be agreed with the Local Planning Authority before development commences. The replacement trees should be planted within the first planting season following commencement of development. Should the replacement trees die, become damaged or diseased within the first five years they shall be replaced within the first planting season following its demise with a species to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
3. No development shall commence until a scheme of landscaping and construction methods has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such a scheme shall indicate those areas of landscaping to be retained, construction methods to be used around landscaping, a scheme for the protection of existing vegetation accordance with BS5837 and full details of surfacing materials.
4. The proposed security lighting hereby approved shall not be operated outside the hours of 0730 to 1900.
5. Before the use of the car park commences the lighting hereby approved shall be shielded and aligned to avoid the spread of light in accordance with the scheme to be the Local Planning Authority and thereafter such lighting shall be maintained to the same specification and adjusted, when necessary, to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.
6. The hedge surrounding the unit shall be retained at a minimum height of 1.5m, unless otherwise agreed with the local planning authority

The decision to grant planning permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Adopted Stockton on Tees Local Plan set out below

Adopted Stockton on Tees Plan policy GP1.

Councillor Stoker left the room for the duration of the item having declared a personal/non prejudicial interest in the above item due to knowing two of the objectors.

- 835      04/3948/FUL (Item A) & 04/3949/AAC (Item B)**  
**Land at Durham Tees Valley Airport**  
**Extension and refurbishment of terminal building, development of cargo and maintenance village (class B2 and B8), new and expanded airside apron including lighting, extension and reconfiguration of passenger and staff car parks and car hire facilities including lighting, access roads and fencing, construction of aircraft stands, airside hard standing and parallel taxiway including lighting, extension and reconfiguration of airport access road, pick up and set down areas including lighting, new bus stop and taxi stands, construction of new sewage treatment plant and associated pipe work (part outline, part full application) accompanied by environmental assessment under the town and country planning (environmental impact assessment) regulations 1999 (additional information in respect of cross section to site received 8 March 2005 and lighting received 6 June 2005).**  
**Expiry date: 16th February 2005**



The report considered two applications, one for the expansion of the main terminal building and associated aviation development (Item A) and one for a Business Park/Hotel/Pub/Restaurant (Item B).

The application site boundary in respect of the airport expansion application (04/3948/FUL) included land within both the administrative area of Darlington Borough Council (DBC) and Stockton Borough Council (SBC). Under normal procedures both Councils would consider the application and would both be required to issue decision notices as the Airport was within the boundaries of both Councils.

It was suggested at the Planning Committee Meeting held on 2nd February 2005 that, should the Council be minded to approve the part of the development that was within this Council's administrative area, in order to simplify the process, the Planning Committee would consider the application through the normal process but delegate authority to Darlington Borough Council to issue the decision notice subject to both Councils being satisfied in respect of the report and final recommendation on the application and any planning conditions and the terms of a Section 106 Legal Agreement, should planning permission be granted. It was resolved that this suggested course of action be approved.

The second application (04/3949/AAC) relating to the Business Park/Hotel lay wholly within the administrative area of Darlington Borough Council which had consulted Stockton Borough Council as an adjoining planning authority.

Both applications were covered by one Environmental Statement (ES) under the Environmental Assessment Regulations and the series of appendices to the report were generally common to both.

The applicant addressed the committee advising that:

- They were running out of capacity.
- Business people coming into the area via the current airport terminal would judge the area on the look of the terminal.
- They welcomed the Officers report and the joint working with Stockton Borough Council and Darlington Borough Council.

A Ward Councillor for Hartburn addressed the committee expressing the concerns of Hartburn residents as they were directly under the flight paths yet Hartburn had not appeared to be consulted.

Some airports had bans on night flights and as increased night flights could result in Hartburn residents suffering from sleep deprivation the Ward Councillors recommended flight time limits whilst other noise matters were considered in the section 106 agreement.

Councillor Cherrett pointed out that he was not the Mr Cherrett who submitted an objection which was in the report.

Members made the following comments:

- Jets were quieter on newer planes.
- Concerned regarding rail links.
- People would rather use Durham Tees Valley Airport than airports further away.

- Concerned regarding the Long Newton Interchange.
- Who would control the occupancy of the proposed buildings?
- The image of the Airport was important and would attract people to the area.
- Pleased that non air transport issues were being addressed and hoped that bus and cycle links would be built.
- Low level noise would only show in tests.
- Traffic to and from the Airport currently went through Yarm, what would be done to alter this especially in light of the proposed extensions to the Airport?
- Would like conditions included regarding noise of night flights.
- The railway went right passed the airport therefore there should be a station close to the airport.
- Would like the scruffy Industrial Estate next to the Airport improved/tidied up.

The applicant responded to Members questions and concerns.

- Surface Access Strategy had moved on and there was a new access route. Cars and bus access had improved and would continue to do so.
- The existing rail facility was poor but they were working on using Dinsdale station with a bus link to and from the airport in the short term. They were in negotiations with the rail service but the rail service would not consider some options as it would affect the main running times of existing services.
- Darlington Council would make the decisions on who occupied the buildings, A list had been agreed and was a condition in the recommendations. They would have preferred not to have the conditions but they accepted them.
- Noisy airplanes were banned from flying at night, however they were trying to encourage other airlines to use Durham Tees Valley Airport and therefore did not wish to bring in too many controls at such an early stage thus inhibiting the Airports growth and development but Members were assured that it would not be more than originally planned. Engines were now quieter so it was less of a problem.
- The Long Newton improvements would begin in the Spring, at the time of the meeting it was out to tender.
- One of the agreed conditions was improving the signage to and from the airport. The A19 and A66 would have signage therefore reducing the use of Yarm.
- They would like more airline maintenance companies set up at the airport which would create jobs.
- They wanted to do a range of services, passenger, business and leisure.
- Whilst they owned some of the industrial areas and were improving those buildings and other companies were improving their buildings, others were proving difficult to encourage improvement.
- Their ES evaluation related to Hartburn had shown the worst case scenarios, however it was not believed that there would be a worst case scenario and it was observed that they had not forgotten Hartburn.

RESOLVED that:

1. Darlington Borough Council be advised that Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council is minded to approve Planning application 04/3948/FUL (DBC reference 04/01427/FULE) and the determination of that application be delegated to Darlington Borough Council subject to the conditions set out in this report (Appendix 1) being incorporated into the decision notice and the applicant entering into a Section 106 Agreement in accordance with the Heads of Terms set out in Appendix 1.

In the event of the Heads of Terms and conditions not being in accordance with those set out in Appendix 1 that the consideration of the varied Heads of Terms and conditions be delegated to the Head of Planning to advise Darlington Borough Council as to whether the application should still be approved and the decision delegated to Darlington Borough Council.

2. It is recommended that Darlington Borough Council be informed that this Council, as an adjoining authority has no objection to the development subject to ensuring through planning conditions or other appropriate controls that the B1 Offices are for airport related development only.

Councillor Cherrett declared a personal/non prejudicial interest in relation the above item due to being on the Durham Tees Valley Consultative Committee.

Councillor Walmsley declared a personal/non prejudicial interest in the above item due to having being in a now resolved dispute with the airport and left the room for the duration of the item.

836

**06/3158/ADV**

**Beck Valley Service Station, Bypass Road, Billingham  
Erection of various illuminated and non-illuminated signs**

The application site was the Beck Valley Service Station situated on the corner of Wolviston Road and Station Road, Billingham. The application site lay adjacent to a fireplace and bathroom showroom to the north, with residential properties beyond and further residential properties to the east of the site.

A recent extension to the unit was granted consent earlier in the year (06/1540/REV) and an application for the installation of 2no. ATM machines and canopy extension was being considered separately under application (06/3247/FUL).

Advertisement consent was sought for the erection of various illuminated and non-illuminated signs as part of the redevelopment of the site into a Tesco's Express store combined with the Esso existing filling station.

The application was put before members of the planning committee due to the number of objections received.

An objector spoke against the application.

Members made the following comments:

- There had always been lighting on the site but it had not been on the residential side of the site, this application would result in light pollution streaming directly into neighbouring houses.
- The Chief Executive of Tesco had stated in a publication that they planned to be green by reducing energy costs and pledged to consult more and make less impact on neighbours.
- Light illuminating onto the dual carriageway would not be a problem.
- DEFRA recommend the tilting of illuminated signs however, the proposed signs would be straight up.

- Did not want the signs and canopy illuminated on Station road.
- Members could not approve part of the application and not the other, therefore the Committee would have to agree or refuse the whole application.
- It was about compromise and finding the best solution.

The Principal Solicitor suggested that an informative could be provided back to Tesco as she did not wish for the Committee to fetter their discretion but by sending back an informative it would be clear that committee's objection was to the illumination near to residential properties and could not be said that the Committee had been unreasonable.

RESOLVED that planning application 06/3158/ADV be refused for the following reasons:

1. In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposed development by virtue of the illuminated signs facing towards Station Road, Billingham would result in increased light pollution and would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the area, contrary to policy GP1 of the adopted Stockton on Tees Local Plan.

837

**06/3113/FUL**

**Our Lady of St Bedes School, Bishopton Road West  
Erection of sports changing facility, with associated classroom and toilets, drama/dance studio and cafeteria and erection of 3 metre high wled mesh type fence around building and football pitches.**

The application site comprised educational units located to the south of Bishopton Road West. To the east of the proposed building lay Stockton Sixth Form College; to the west lay Our Lady and St Bedes Comprehensive School. A cycle track bounded by mature trees lay to the west of the application, Grangefield Comprehensive School lay to the south and the new Persimmon Homes development lay to the east of the application site.

The applicant sought permission for the erection of a sports changing facility, with associated classroom and toilets, drama/dance studio and cafeteria and the erection of a 3 metre high weld mesh type fence around the building and football pitches.

The main planning considerations in respect of the proposal related to the impact of the proposal on the street scene and the neighbouring properties.

There had been 5 letter of objection received with regards to the development and 5 consultation responses from Consults. The objections relate to the increased noise, anti-social behaviour and the visual impact of the proposed fence.

Correspondence was received from a Ward Councillor who requested that residents' concerns were addressed prior to a decision being made. Specifically those relating to whether floodlights were to be installed at a later date and if it would be subject to a separate planning application.

The Ward Councillor also queried whether the community use agreement would bear in mind the impact on the neighbouring properties in terms of noise an if

sufficient free days/evenings , particularly Sundays so it was not seen as continuous.

The update report advised that the applicant had no plans to install floodlighting on the field and if for any reason it was required in the future then a separate planning application would be required. It would be assessed on its own merit and the impact on the neighbouring properties would be taken into consideration.

A civil document had been drawn up between the applicant, users of the site and Sports England in regard to the community use agreement.

The application was for a new building and a secure fence around the playing fields and the Local Planning Authority did not have the power to restrict the hours of use on the school playing field when determining the application.

The application was not for a change of use; it was solely for the erection of a building and a security fence to provide improved and safer facilities for the school and the local community.

In relation to the level of noise, Environmental Health had been consulted with regards to the application and had no objections to the scheme as they considered that it would not have a detrimental impact on the neighbouring residents. It was considered that the anti social behaviour use of the neighbours hedgerows would reduce as the site would have a modern changing facility.

The Head of Integrated Transport and Environmental policy had been consulted in regards to objectors concerns regarding increased pedestrian and vehicular traffic and parking on grass verges outside the site who advised that he had no objections to the development and considered that it would not have an adverse impact on the surrounding area.

It was considered that the proposed building was in keeping with the surrounding area in terms of size, style and design, the field was currently used as football pitches and the fence was not considered to have a detrimental impact on the neighbouring properties. It was considered that the proposal accorded with adopted Local Plan policy and it was recommended that planning permission be granted.

An objector spoke against the application.

Members made the following comments:

- Objectors had complained about a similar application in another area yet they were the same people who had complained about kids hanging around on their street corners.
- Should encourage the football players to be good neighbours and control their language.
- There were too few sports facilities in the Borough, we should therefore be supporting such applications
- The Government want schools to be used by the local community which would therefore increase the time of use.

- Members got clarification regarding the placement of the fence.

RESOLVED that the decision in respect of planning application (06/3113/FUL) be delegated to the Head of Planning and subject to no new issues raised within the neighbour notification period that planning permission be approved subject to the following conditions:

In the event that there are matters that cannot be resolved or unresolved on 12th December 2006 planning permission is refused.

1. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan(s): unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Drawing Number(s): - DRWG001, DRWG002, DRWG003, DRWG004, DRWG005, DRWG006

2. Details of all finishing materials shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to work being carried out on site. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

3. Notwithstanding the submitted information, secure cycle parking spaces shall be provided within the site, details of which must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of the development.

4. Notwithstanding the submitted information, prior to the commencement of the development details of the colour of the proposed fence shall be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority and implemented on site, and maintained thereafter for the life of the fence hereby permitted.

5. Details of a scheme in accordance with BS5837: 2005 to protect the existing trees and vegetation shall be provided to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority. Such a scheme shall include details of a protective fence of appropriate specification, and that the fence as approved shall be erected before construction commences, and maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority, and throughout the entire building period, that changes in levels near the branch spread of the trees will be avoided, where tree roots are encountered only hand digging will be allowed, compaction to the root spread of the tree will be avoided and no storage of materials will be permitted within the branch spread of the trees. The approved scheme shall be implemented in full.

6. Prior to the commencement of development of the site a Community Use agreement shall be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in respect of the provision of the replacement playing pitches. The plan shall include details of pricing policy, hours of use, management and maintenance. The plan shall then be implemented upon commencement of use of the pitches.

The decision to grant planning permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Adopted Stockton on Tees Local Plan set out below

Policy GP1

The application site was formed by a collection of industrial units located in the southeastern part of Preston Farm Industrial Estate. The site was bounded to the north by Concorde Way, to the east by Lockhead Close and to the west by Handley Close. Other industrial and office uses were sited adjacent to the premises.

The applicant sought permission for the Change of use from B2 use to B8 Storage and Distribution with ancillary B1 office use. Works would include part demolition and re-cladding and sub-division of the existing units and creation of a new entrance.

The main planning considerations in respect of the proposal related to the impact of the proposal on the industrial estate and the surrounding area.

There had been objections raised by the Head of Integrated Transport and Environmental Policy. The applicant had been notified of these objections and had submitted additional information and superseding plans in order to address concerns raised by the Head of Integrated Transport and Environmental Policy. Those documents and plans were under consideration and the deadline for consultation response was the 12th December 2006.

Given that the area was designated for industrial use in the Adopted Local Plan and the previous activities on site operated by MFI / Hygena and the layout of the proposal it was not envisaged that there would be a detrimental impact on the adjacent properties by granting approval to the application.

It was considered that the proposal accorded with adopted local plan policy and was recommended that planning permission be granted subject to the amendments requested by The Head of Integrated Transport and Environmental Policy.

RESOLVED that the decision in respect of planning application 06/3137/COU be delegated to the Head of Planning and that subject to satisfactory resolution of outstanding highway matters, planning permission is granted. Or, in the event that those matters cannot or are not satisfactorily addressed by 19th December 2006, that planning permission is refused.

1. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan(s); unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Drawing Number(s) :- SBC001,  
633-PL-05,06a,07a,08a,09a,10a,11a,12a,13a,14.

2. Details of all finishing materials shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to work being carried out on site.

Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

3. Notwithstanding details hereby approved, the existing access onto Handley Close shall be restricted in use to solely serve unit 4b as indicated on the approved plans and shall serve no point of access or egress for any other units apart from as a means of emergency access.

The decision to grant planning permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Structure Plan and Stockton on Tees Local Plan Policy/Policies: GP1 and IN1 (c.)

839

**06/3283/FUL**

**Kentisbury, The Spital, Yarm**

**Application to widen driveway across grass verge**

The application site was a residential dwelling located on The Spital, Yarm. The site was bounded by other residential properties to the north and east.

The applicant sought permission for the widening of the driveway into his property across the existing grass verge.

The main planning considerations in respect of the proposal related to the impact of the proposal on the street scene and the surrounding area.

Numerous objections had been received with regards to the development. These were on the grounds of vehicle and pedestrian safety, the demolition of the wall and trees to the front of the property, the fact that the objectors believed that the land the applicant owned was not in his ownership and the objectors believed the applicant was only applying for the driveway to accommodate a dwelling in his back garden.

The Head of Integrated Transport and Environmental Policy had stated that the Design Guide stated a vehicular access for a singular property should be a maximum width of 5 metres.

Given that the demolition of the wall was permitted development and the applicant only required permission because The Spital was a classified road, it was considered that the application would not have a detrimental impact on the character of the area or the street scene as a whole. The applicant had originally proposed a width of 6.1m for which The Head of Integrated Transport had not provided a specific reason other than conflict with Council standards, as to why this width was unacceptable then it was considered that there was not a planning reason for refusal of the application. However the applicant submitted superseding plans reducing the width of the proposed drive to 5 metres as per the recommendations from the Head of Integrated Transport and Environmental Policy.

Residents were reconsulted with regards to the reduction in width of the proposed drive. A further five representations were received all stating their objection to the amended application.

It was considered that the proposal accorded with the adopted local plan.



An objector spoke against the application. There were concerns that the applicant had a hidden agenda and there was a lack of clarity as to who owned the grass verge.

Members requested confirmation of land ownership before they could make a decision on the application.

The Principal Solicitor advised that it was adopted highway but the ownership of the land had not been confirmed, however land ownership was not an issue for consideration at the meeting as it was not a planning consideration. The applicant would need to apply to the Highways department if the application was approved and if he did not own the land he would need to purchase it or obtain the agreement of the owner before the work could begin.

RESOLVED that planning application 06/3283/FUL be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan(s); unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Drawing Numbers: SBC001, DRWG001, DRWG002.

#### **840 Local Development Framework Minutes**

Members considered the minutes of the Local Development Framework Steering Group.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Local Development Steering Group be approved.

#### **841 Code of Practice**

The Local Government Association recommended that local planning authorities agreed a local Code of Practice to elected Members and Officers in the way they dealt with planning applications to avoid allegations of malpractice in the operation of the planning system. The original guidance was published following the Nolan Committee report in 1997 and updated following the introduction of the new Model Code of Conduct in November 2001. That guidance had been updated following a review of the impact of the Code of Conduct and accordingly the Council's Planning Code of Good Practice had been amended to include the new recommendations.

Members pointed out that the guidelines in relation to pre application discussions with developers or applicants should take account of confidentiality requirements. Therefore it would not always be possible to report Members involvement in pre application discussions or obtain the approval of the committee for attendance at presentations. Accordingly, the guidelines would be revised to take this into account.

There were some concerns about the responsibility for declaring interests at paragraph 9.6 of the draft code. One of the examples provided showed that it

was likely that a Member would be required to declare an interest on a planning matter, where their spouse or partner had an interest in the matter; Some Members felt this would be difficult to comply with since they might not have been aware of their spouse or partner's interest.

RESOLVED that:

1. The Draft Planning Code of Good Practice be noted.
2. Any further comments members may wish to make be submitted in writing to the Head of Legal Services by 20 December 2006.
3. Any further amendments to the Code be delegated to the Head of Legal Services in consultation with the Head of Planning prior to its submission to Cabinet.
4. The code be referred to Cabinet with a recommendation for approval by Council.

- 842**
- 1. Appeal - Mrs Kaur - 188 Darlington Lane, Stockton (06/0042/FUL) - ALLOWED**
  - 2. Appeal - Dr Wilkinson - 43 Penberry Gardens, Ingleby Barwick, Stockton (05/2341/FPD) - ALLOWED**
  - 3. Mr Iqbal 0 90a Hartington Road, Stockton (06/0008/COU) - DISMISSED**
  - 4. Mr Brownless - Chadwicks, 104 High Street, Yarm (05/2750/ARC) - DISMISSED**
  - 5. Mr Boylett - Kentisbury, The Spital, Yarm (05/3472/REV) - DISMISSED**
  - 6. Mrs Webster & Mr Brown - Land at Middle Bank, Thorpe Thewles, Stockton (05/3385/COU) - ALLOWED**